

ACTIVE CASES
Analysis September 2003 QA Results for Food Stamps

Sample Size: 94
(drops excluded)

Statewide Total September:

Total Issuance in Sample:	\$15,923.00
Total Number Error Cases:	19
Error Amount Total:	\$ 2,292.00
Percentage of Dollars in Error:	14.39%
FFY 2003 Error Rate YTD:	9.2%

****(20.2% of the total number of cases sampled were in error)****

Milwaukee County September:

Total Issuance in Sample:	\$7,578.00
Tot Number of Error Cases:	9
Error Amount Total:	\$1,077.00
Percentage of Dollars in Error:	14.2 %
FFY 2003 Error Rate:	11.8%

Rest of State- September:

Total Issuance in Sample:	\$ 8,345.00
Total Number of Error Cases:	10
Error Amount Total:	\$ 1,215.00
Percentage of Dollars in Error:	14.6%
FFY 2003 Error Rate:	7.1%

REDUCED REPORTING : (Phase 1)

A review of error cases that in the best-case scenario would not be considered errors under the new reduced reporting rules shows the following results. The error rate for September would look like this:

- **Statewide Totals:**

Total Number Error Cases:	17
Error Amount Total:	\$ 2,019.00
Percentage of Dollars in Error:	12.7% (Sept)

- **Milwaukee County Totals:** (under Phase 1 of Reduced Reporting)

Total Number of Error Cases:	9	
Error Amount Total:	\$1077	
Percentage of Dollars in Error:	14.2%	(Sept)

- **Rest of State Totals** (under Phase 1 of Reduced Reporting)

Total Number of Error Cases:	8	
Error Amount Total:	\$ 942	
Percentage of Dollars in Error:	11.3%	(Sept)

Statewide, of the 19 errors:

- **10** agency preventable errors.
- **1** “agency” (W2 contractor failed to tell ESA that client reported going on maternity leave)
- **5** client “failure to report” errors—two of which would likely not be considered errors under new reporting rules.
- **3** CARES “errors”- W2 not budgeted or not removed for FS calculation.
-

Overview of the errors and where they occurred:

- Of the 10 APES and 1 agency error: 6 were in Milwaukee, and 4 in balance of state.
- **Type of APES and “agency” errors (10):**
 - **4-** earned income: failure to budget accurately at cert/recert.
 - **1-** childcare expense incorrectly budgeted
 - **1-** CS expense not budgeted, though known
 - **1-** shelter-failed to prorate property taxes over 12 months
 - **1-** Data Exchange: failed to act on SS DX for 5 months
 - **1-** FSET sanction- eligible person excluded- had re-requested FS
 - **1-**W2 agency failed to tell ESA that client reported going on maternity leave (counted as “agency” error, not APE)
- **Types of client non-reporting errors (5):**
 - **1-** Failure to report return to work (exceeded 130% FPL)
 - **1-**Failure to report job ended
 - **1-** Failure to report CS increase over \$100/mo (and same case FTR earnings change on 10 mo cert.)
 - **1-**Failure to report an asset which was over the eligibility limit.
 - **1-**Failure to report Kinship Care income
- **Types of CARES errors (3):**
 - **2-** W2 income not included in FS budget that should have been

- 1- W2 income included in FS budget when W2 had ended previously

Trends or Possible Recommendations?

- A most “unfortunate” month after many positive months. September is traditionally higher, but not this high.
- Ten agencies shared in this 19-error month.
- This month doesn’t show as much positive effect of the reduced reporting rules because so many were errors caused by agencies on information they had or were required to collect at application or re-certification. In Milwaukee only one of the nine errors were caused by client failure to report.
- Most APEs were caused by incorrect budgeting of income or expenses at cert or re-certification. Suggest continuing to emphasize correct budgeting and documenting of reasoning at cert/re-cert. Possibly suggest to agencies they instruct workers to put the links to the FS on-line handbook and the Eligibility Management homepage as desktop icons, and to open them at begin of each work day. This should encourage more conscious on-going reference to policy and other available resources.

“Biggest Contributors”: The cases that caused the largest dollar errors for September 2003 (including client errors): Note while these four cases caused the larger errors, the sheer numbers of errors makes the balance of errors significant in the rate. Without the four largest, \$1,542 dollars were still issued in error, twice the entire total error in the previous month.

- Marathon County, \$224 Client Error: failure to report job ended. This occurred prior to reduced reporting rules change. This would not be an error in the future.
- Milwaukee County, \$225 Agency Error: W2 contractor failed to report to the ES agency that client reported she went on maternity leave from employment. Not considered an APE.
- Milwaukee County: \$262 APE: incorrect budgeting of contract earnings. The total error was offset slightly by another agency error in budgeting of shelter expenses.
- Dodge County: \$396 Client Error: The client failed to report a savings account at FS application. The balance exceeded the asset limits for the program.